DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 743 HE 002 545

TITLE Annual Report 1970, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

INSTITUTION North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Chicago, Ill.

PUB DATE Mar 71

NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *Annual Reports; Evaluation; *Higher Education

IDENTIFIERS *Commisson on Institutions of Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This Annual Report of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education reviews the major policies and procedures through which the commission carries out its function of accreditation of institutions in the North Central Association area. The Commission is Responsible for the establishment of criteria to evaluate higher education institutions, for aiding interested institutions in attaining membership in the Association, for assisting member institutions in the improvement and extension of their programs, for the conduct of workshops for consultants and examiners, and for the study of matters of common concern to colleges and universities. The policies discussed are: (1) correspondent status for nonaccredited institutions; (2) recognized candidate for accreditation status; (3) accredited status; (4) the periodic review of member institutions; (5) the preliminary and full accreditation of member institutions undergoing substantive change; (6) separate accreditation of campuses in multicampus systems; and (7) transfer of accreditation. The official procedures of the Commission are reproduced at the conclusion of the report. (AF)

ED054743

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ANNUAL REPORT 1970

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

arizona • arkansas • colorado • illinois • indiana • iowa • kansas • michigan
minnesota • missouri • nebraska • new mexico • north dakota • ohio
oklahoma • south dakota • west virginia • wisconsin • wyoming

ED054743

EXECUTIVE BOARD

(Members of the Executive Board are automatically members of the Commission)

Chairman: DONALD C. ROUSH, Academic Vice President, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001 (1972)

Vice Chairman: ROBERT L. CLODIUS,. Vice President, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706 (1973)

COLMAN J. BARRY, O.S.B., President, Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321 (1974)

WADE ELLIS,, Associate Dean, Graduate School, and Professor of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104 (1975)

E. S. FRENCH, President, Northeastern Junior College, Sterling, Colorado 80751 (1972)

ROBERT J. KELLER, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 (1971)

F. HAROLD MATTHEWS, Dean, Vocational-Technical Education, Jackson Community College, Jackson, Michigan 49201 (1972)

JOHN J. PRUIS, President, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306 (1975)

PAUL H. SILVERMAN, Professor of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (1974)

FRED C. SUTTON, Dean of Technical-Vocational Education, Cuyahoga Community College-Metropolitan Campus, Cleveland, Ohio 44115 (1974)

SHARVY G. UMBECK, President, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois 61401 (1971)

LLOYD E. WORNER, President, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903 (1973)

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Executive Secretary: NORMAN BURNS, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Associate Executive Secretary: JOSEPH J. SEMROW, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60615

Assistant Executive Secretary: ROBERT C. BARTLETT, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60615

Assistant Executive Secretary: THOMAS J. COFFEY, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60615

Assistant Executive Secretary: THOMAS A. GILLIS, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60615

Administrative Assistant: CATHERINE MCQUARRIE, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60615

COMMISSIONERS

Class of 1971

WILLARD L. BOYD, President, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240
ERNEST V. CLEMENTS, President, Wright College, City Colleges of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60634
E. D. FARWELL, President, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa 52101
PHILIP J. GANNON, President, Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan 48914
ELLSWORTH GERRITZ, Dean of Admissions and Records, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66502
PARKER E. LICHTENSTEIN, Professor of Psychology, Denison University, Granville, Ohio 43023
WILLIAM J. MICHEELS, President, Stout State University, Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751
JOHN P. RAYNOR, S. J., President, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
PAUL W. RENICH, President, Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kansas 67401
J. LAWRENCE WALKUP, President, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
WESLEY M. WESTERBERG, President, Kendall College, Evanston, Illinois 60204

Class of 1972

ROBERT P. ASHLEY, Vice President and Dean of the College, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin 54971
RODNEY BERG, President, College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137
RICHARD L. CUTLER, Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
KARL H. DANNENFELDT, Academic Vice President, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281
JOE E. ELMORE, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana 47374
CONRAD HILBERRY, Professor of English, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001
PAUL G. JENSON, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Temple Buell College, Denver, Colorado 80220
WILLIAM F. KELLEY, S. J., Director, Governmental Relations and Special Resources, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska 68131
DONALD B. KING, Dean, St. Norbert College, West DePere, Wisconsin 54178
RALPH D. NORMAN, Professor of Psychology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106
SILAS D. SNOW, President, State College of Arkansas, Conway, Arkansas 72032
A. MERVIN TYSON, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia 25701

Class of 1973

ROBERT P. COBB, Associate Dean of Faculties for International Programs, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044
MARION G. DONALDSON, District Vice President, and Executive Dean, Scottsdale Community College, Scottsdale, Arizona 85252
LEE S. DREYFUS, President, Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481
JAMES G. HARLOW, President, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
ELMER JAGOW, President, Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio 44234
CHARLES J. MCCLAIN, President, Northeast Missouri State College, Kirksville, Missouri 63501
WILLIAM E. NEPTUNE, Dean of Liberal Arts, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801
PAUL F. SHARP, President, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa 50311
IRVIN G. WYLLIE, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, Wisconsin 53140

Class of 1974

CHARLES M. BARNES, President, Dodge City Community Junior College, Dodge City, Kansas 67801
JAY BARTON, Provost for Instruction, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
WALTER C. DANIEL, President, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
ROLAND DILLE, President, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minnesota 56560
EDWARD B. ESPENSHADE, Professor of Geography, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201
RALPH S. FJELSTAD, Congdon Professor of Government, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota 55057
WALLACE B. GRAVES, President, University of Evansville, Evansville, Indiana 47704
VIVIAN H. HEWER, Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
ALBERT J. REISS, JR., Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
ROY B. SHILLING, President, Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas 72032
ROBERT D. SWANSON, President, Alma College, Alma, Michigan 48801
W. L. TOMPKINS, President, Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Missouri 65340
JOHN E. VISSER, President, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas 66801
JOSEPH F. WALL, Dean of the College, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa 50112
RALPH WERNER, President, Bismarck Junior College, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

SECONDARY SCHOOL MEMBERS
(Appointed by the Commission on Secondary Schools)

W. EARL HARMON, Principal, West High School, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin 53222 (1974)
ALVIN MORRIS, Superintendent, Wichita, Public Schools, 428 S. Broadway, Wichita, Kansas, 67202 (1971)
SCOTT D. THOMSON, Superintendent, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois 60204 (1973)

FOREWARD

This Annual Report of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education presents an account of the major activities of the Commission in carrying out its function of accreditation of institutions in the North Central Association area. This area which covers 19 states includes 575 accredited institutions, 51 Recognized Candidates for Accreditation and 91 Correspondent institutions. These institutions are listed in the summer issue of the *North Central Association Quarterly.*

With the publication of this Annual Report the Commission is using a new format in order to provide interested publics with more information about its activities. In prior years the *Proceedings of the Commission* which are reported annually in the summer issue of the *North Central Association Quarterly* served as the means of conveying information about the activities of the Commission. However, because of the increasing concerns of the Commission, the continued and dramatic growth in numbers and variety of institutions and students enrolled in institutions of higher education following World War II, and because of the increasing importance of the function of accreditation, a report of broader scope seemed necessary and appropriate.

In the following pages we have traced the development of the policies and procedures of the Commission that reflect its attempt to respond effectively to the demand for maintenance of quality in higher education. The increasing dimensions of the Commission's role, we believe, reveal a sensitivity to assist institutions in meeting the challenges they continually face in responding to the needs of American society.

Our appreciation is extended to all those who have contributed so generously of their time and effort to the work of the Commission.

Donald Roush
Chairman

Norman Burns
Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education is one of three constituent Commissions of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The two other major components are the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Research and Service. Information concerning the Association as a whole and its Commissions may be found in the summer issue of the *North Central Association Quarterly.* In addition, two volumes detailing the history of the Association have been published. They are *A History of the North Central Association*[1] and *Voluntary Accreditation.*[2]

This report will deal entirely with and reflect the purposes of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. This Commission is responsible for the establishment of criteria for the evaluation of institutions of higher education, for aiding interested institutions in attaining membership in the Association, for assisting member institutions in the improvement and the extension of their programs, for the conduct of workshops for consultants and examiners, and for the study of matters of common concern to colleges and universities. Through a variety of means the Commission attempts to contribute to the improvement of higher education in the territory it serves.

---

[1] Davis, Calvin O. *A History of the North Central Association.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1945.

[2] Geiger, Louis G. *Voluntary Accreditation.* Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, 1970.

In many respects the end of World War II marks a watershed for higher education in the United States. Many societal influences have converged during and since that time that have profoundly affected the nature of the higher education enterprise. Universities have developed multicampus systems and state colleges have been transformed into multipurpose institutions moving toward university status. The number of junior-community colleges has grown at an astounding rate, while institutions offering technical-vocational and occupational programs have assumed an increasing importance. New programs of study have been developed and existing ones modified to meet new needs. A variety of mergers, consortia, and cooperative associations among institutions has taken place. From students, faculty members, public officials, and others have come challenges to the purposes, means, and the authority structure in higher education.

During this period the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education has been undergoing marked change. The policies and procedures under which it operates have been subjected to continuing modification and refinement to meet the increasing complexities and special problems in the field of higher education.

In attempting to improve its operations the Commission has responded in a number of ways. Among the developments, the following seem to be of special significance and merit some elaboration: (1) the training and orientation of a selected group of consultant-examiners who are available on a continual and consistent basis for on-site evaluations; (2) the modification of the Commission's eligibility requirements for post-secondary institutions seeking membership in the Association; and (3) a reemphasis on self-study, stressing revitalization and self-renewal.

The consultant-examiner corps is a group of individuals

chosen in recognition of their outstanding professional and academic achievements, either in their respective disciplines or as evidenced by the leadership positions they occupy in higher education institutions. From this group teams are comprised that will make on-site visits to institutions for purposes of evaluation and accreditation. Since its inception, the consultant-examiner corps has been substantially strengthened through a program of systematic recruitment and training of personnel to be inducted to the corps. A preservice and an in-service program for the members constitutes an important aspect of the work of the Commission. For example, a consultant-examiner conference is sponsored annually by the Commission to provide an opportunity for discussion of developments in higher education and ever-changing problems in accreditation. In this period when evaluative criteria rest heavily upon qualitative rather than quantitative measures, it is essential that persons of recognized authority and expertise in their respective fields can be called upon and become involved in the accrediting function.

It is the purpose of each on-site visiting team to compile a report of its findings, copies of which are sent to the institution for its information and use. The report also becomes the basis for decision-making with respect to an institution's status. Over the last several years examining teams have conducted on the average of 150-160 evaluations of institutions annually in the North Central area.

In seeking to keep pace with a system of higher education characterized by growing pluralism the Commission has modified the criteria for eligibility for accreditation to permit the inclusion of virtually all segments of post-secondary education, including non-degree, post-secondary institutions specializing in vocational-technical or occupational education. Throughout its early history, the Commission was largely concerned with liberal arts colleges. Even in the evaluation of

the comprehensive university and the junior college, the focus of these early years was on the liberal arts component. As higher education in the United States came to be characterized by greater diversity, the pressure on the Commission to broaden its scope of accrediting activities increased. In 1958, the Commission adopted a policy which enabled specialized types of institutions — art schools, music schools, seminaries, technical institutes — to apply for membership in the Association. This was followed, as was noted earlier, by the further modification of eligibility criteria to permit non-degree, post-secondary institutions to apply for membership. Only those institutions in the occupational sector which are already eligible for accreditation by a recognized professional accrediting agency are ineligible.

Of prime importance to the Commission in this period of rapid social change has been a reemphasis on the process of self-study on a systematic and continual basis. The Commission has adapted the self-study process to accommodate a variety of situations in which an institution may find itself at particular stages of development.

The major activities of this accrediting Commission are grouped under the following headings: Correspondent of the Commission; Recognized Candidate for Accreditation; Accredited Status; Periodic Review or Reexamination of Accredited Institutions; Preliminary and Full Accreditation of Institutions Undergoing Substantive Change; Separate Accreditation of Campuses in Multi-campus Systems; Transfer of Accreditation. Each of these activities is described in more detail in the following pages.

Correspondent of the Commission

Correspondent status offers non-member (non-accredited) institutions a publicly recognized status within the North Central Association. Application for this status is optional and available only to newly-established institutions. It is granted to those institutions that appear to possess sufficient potential strength to undergo an examination for Recognized Candidate for Accreditation status in the relatively near future.

Correspondent status, which was formally initiated in 1967, provides the newly-established institution an opportunity to lay the groundwork for a more thorough self-study by the development of an *Institutional Analysis Report* which is completed in application for evaluation or examination. Following receipt and acceptance of the application by the Commission, a team of North Central Association examiners visits the institution for an assessment of its potential for growth into an institution of acceptable quality. Copies of the report of the examiners are sent to the institution, and the report may become a useful reference for the institution in further development. The recommendations of the team contained in the examiners' report with respect to the granting of Correspondent status are processed through the decision-making levels of the Commission and the Association for approval.[3] In the last five years 168 examinations for Correspondent status have been made. This resulted in 117 instances where the status was approved and 51 cases in which the status was denied.

In this, as in other aspects of the Commission's work, every effort is made to assist institutions by communicating

[3] The decision-making procedures of the Commission are explained in the final section of this report under the heading, "Procedures of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education."

the policies, procedures, and expectations of the Commission to them. Most institutions holding Correspondent status avail themselves of consultant services provided by the Commission for assistance in working toward accreditation. Failure to make the appropriate degree of progress toward accreditation may result in the institution's loss of Correspondent status.

Recognized Candidate for Accreditation Status

Recognized Candidate for Accreditation, usually the next stage in the accreditation process, was originated in 1961. It represents a more advanced state of institutional development and institutions may apply for this status after they have been in operation one year. An institutional document called the *Status Study* is filed with the Office of the Secretary in application for an on-site examination for approval for this status. The *Status Study* represents a higher level of institutional self-study and a more sophisticated understanding of the institution, its problems, and future course of development. This category is designed to give a formal status to those institutions which are actively working toward accreditation and membership in the Association. Following acceptance of the *Status Study,* an on-site evaluation is made by a team of examiners. The examiners' report, as in the case of Correspondent status, becomes the basis for decision-making by the Commission and the Association. The approval of institutions for either Correspondent status or Recognized Candidacy does not imply or guarantee eventual accreditation.

In the past five years 72 institutions were examined for Recognized Candidate for Accreditation status and 55 institutions were approved. The majority of the institutions applying for either of the preaccredited statuses are two-year junior-community colleges.

Accredited Status

Basic to the procedures for application for accreditation has been the self-study process. It should result in a highly sophisticated, self-analytical institutional document in which the emphasis is placed on an introspective analysis of institutional strengths and weaknesses and realistic plans and projections for overcoming the weaknesses. Logically, the *Self-Study* builds upon and completes the work begun in the *Status Study* and *Institutional Analysis Report.* The *Self-Study* is an examination of all facets of the educational enterprise by the various segments of the academic community. Each group — faculty, administration and students — makes a contribution to complete the total picture of the institution. The self-study process provides a means for involving the members of a particular educational community in the life of the institution. It permits greater understanding of the institution's purposes and the means for, and its success in, achieving them. It points the way toward redirection, self-renewal, or revitalization where or when necessary. The *Self-Study* as an institutional document is ideally utilized as a reference point or basis for future planning and growth.

Acceptance of the *Self-Study* by the Commission is followed by an on-site evaluation by a team of examiners selected from the consultant-examiner corps. The team files its report of the examination with the Office of the Secretary for action by the Commission and the Association. The recommendations in the report form the basis on which the decision is made on whether to accredit the applying institution. The report provides a useful analysis for the institution by an outside group of visiting experts. In the past five years 60 institutions were examined for accreditation and of these 49 were approved.

The Periodic Review of Member Institutions

The program for the periodic review of accredited or member institutions (the terms are synonymous) had a modest beginning in the late fifties. Prior to that time, the only review of member institutions exercised by the Commission, other than those institutions that for some exceptional reason came to the attention of the Commission, was through a system of written reporting. This came to be recognized as a wholly inadequate means for appraising institutional quality. As a result, self-study techniques were devised for member institutions and a schedule of on-site visits was instituted for evaluation purposes following the completion of the self-study materials. Approximately one-tenth of the membership is reviewed each year.

In the beginning, the program of institutional on-site evaluation by teams composed of members of the Commission was seen as mutually beneficial both to the institutions and the Commissioners. The primary thrust in this early stage was the mutual exchange of ideas that would contribute to overall improvement of institutions in the membership. Typically, reviewing teams for even large, comprehensive institutions were small, usually consisting of two or three members. From this beginning a systematic program of regularly scheduled evaluation visits for reaccrediting purposes evolved. Inherent in this approach is the assumption that no institution will remain unchanged throughout its existence and that each institution as it seeks to cope with changes and new influences can benefit from the experiences of this program. At present each member institution is expected to demonstrate anew, at least once every ten years, its qualifications for full status as an accredited institution through self-study and evaluation by an on-site visiting team. The process of reexamination of member institutions has become as rigorous as an evaluation for initial accreditation. The reports of the examiners become

not only the basis for accrediting decisions, but also serve as a useful means for internal control and assessment of progress by the institution.

Currently, 575 institutions have been accredited and are members of the North Central Association. The number, by highest degree level, is as follows:

Associate degree	114
Bachelor's degree	260
Master's degree	106
First professional degree	2
Specialist Degree	20
Doctor's degree	73
Total	575

The first ten-year review cycle was completed in 1968. The Commission is now in the second cycle of periodic review of all member institutions. As the Commission gains experience through this program, it is expected that the benefits of the self-study and on-site evaluations will provide ever increasing assistance to institutions in developing ways to maintain and improve the quality of their educational programs.

The report to this point has related the essential mechanisms and philosophy of the Commission with respect to the accreditation and reaccreditation of institutions. Certain unique situations have arisen, particularly with respect to member institutions. The policies devised by the Commission to render service to institutions in these special circumstances are traced in the following paragraphs.

Preliminary and Full Accreditation of Member Institutions Undergoing Substantive Change

One of the dramatic developments in American higher education in recent years has been the transformation of

simply organized, limited purpose institutions into multi-purpose institutions, many moving toward university status. In an effort to meet the rapidly expanding demands of American society for educational opportunities at the professional school and graduate school levels, some institutions have attempted to expand without proper regard for the maintenance of acceptable quality for both existing and projected programs. In response to the need for quality control in the case of member institutions undergoing substantial expansion in the range of their activities, the Commission devised the policy called "preliminary accreditation." Under this policy institutions moving to a higher degree level or contemplating a significant horizontal expansion of programs are expected to seek authorization of the Commission prior to the introduction of such offerings. The purpose of this policy is to provide assurance to students and other interested parties that to the greatest extent possible these new institutional developments will be of satisfactory quality and will be established on a strong institutional base. Experience has shown that it is difficult to influence the course of new developments without causing undue hardship to students and the institution unless some judgment regarding quality is made prior to the time of actual initiation.

The institution is expected to complete a self-study to be submitted in application for an on-site visit by North Central Association examiners. If the evaluation team concurs that the expansion plans are well-conceived and that the necessary resources are available, the accreditation status of the institution is extended to include preliminary accreditation for the projected offerings. Since preliminary accreditation is conceived of as a means of assuring acceptable quality in the initial offering of any new educational program, it carries the connotation of accreditation as applied generally, and no limits or proscriptions are attached to the concept. After the pro-

gram has matured, that is, after graduates have been produced, the Commission will revisit the institution for "full accreditation" to confirm the promise and potential of its earlier approval.

Since its adoption in the early sixties, the program of preliminary accreditation has proved to be extremely effective in fulfilling the purpose for which it was designed — the determination of institutional readiness for proposed changes prior to their introduction. This program has won the support of numerous professional societies as a means of ensuring quality control at the graduate level. It has enabled the Commission to work cooperatively with a number of state coordinating agencies to assist in the development of quality educational programs. The policy on preliminary accreditation in no way permits the substitution of judgment of the Commission for that of any legally authorized body. The two functions are separate and distinct: the responsibility of the board of control or other authorizing agencies is to define and approve programs within the scope of the institution's mission; the Commission's concern is with the maintenance and improvement of acceptable educational quality.

Over the past several years 120 institutions, ranging from junior colleges moving to the bachelor's degree-granting level through institutions proposing to initiate doctoral level programs, have had their accreditation extended to include preliminary accreditation for some 250 new programs. Approximately forty applications for preliminary and full accreditation are received by the Commission each year. Generally, three-fourths of these applications are approved as a result of their processing through the decision-making procedures of the Commission and Association.

In executing the policy on preliminary accreditation the Commission has made every effort to assure that the interests

of specialism or individual program accreditation will not override the general and institution-wide concern which must be of paramount significance to a general institutional accrediting agency. At the same time it must be recognized that institutions develop graduate programs in specific fields, which necessitates representation on the evaluation team of both general and specific competence.

Separate Accreditation of Campuses in Multi-Campus Systems

In 1965, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education developed the concept of separate accreditation of geographically separate units of a multi-purpose institution which met the following conditions:

1) the unit is under the general control of a parent institution or a central administration in a multi-campus institution;
2) the unit has a core of full-time faculty, a separate student body at the location, and a resident administration;
3) the unit offers programs comprising at least two years of degree credit course work or complete programs comprising preparation for entry into skilled occupations.

Off-campus or extension programs which are more limited than those defined above as separately accreditable are included in the evaluation of the parent institution.

The degree of control of the separate units by the central administration does not affect the designation of a campus as a separate unit for accrediting purposes. Such designation merely facilitates the handling of the accrediting procedure and in no way interferes with the right of an institution to devise its own organizational structure or program.

Separate accreditation of geographically separate units was developed in recognition of the need for more effective quality control in all units of multi-campus institutions. Adequate attention to differential quality among the several geographically separated units in such institutions proved to be difficult under the procedures for evaluation of all the distinct units as one institution. In fulfilling this policy the usual self-study procedures and evaluation processes prevail.

In the last five years thirty-nine campuses of member institutions have been evaluated for separate accreditation. Thirty-eight of these campuses were granted accreditation and are separately listed under the parent institution in the *North Central Association Quarterly's* annual roster of members. Most were found to be of sufficient quality to merit accreditation in a separate status, while other units were more developmental in character and have been scheduled for early review. Approximately 12-15 evaluations of operationally separate units have now been scheduled each year from the spring of 1971 through 1975.

The policy of separate accreditation of geographically separate units of an institution may also involve applications for a pre-accreditation status as well as initial full accreditation. The policy has, therefore, facilitated work with developing multi-campus institutions in which some units are ready to apply for an accredited status in the North Central Association before others.

Though some problems still remain in connection with separate accreditation of geographically separate units of an institution, experience with this program has persuaded the Commission of its usefulness in making qualitative distinctions among the several units of an institution which operates on more than one campus or location.

Transfer of Accreditation

The policy of transfer of accreditation provides for continuity in the accreditation of a member institution following a significant change in its status or control through permitting the Commission to transfer the accreditation of the former institution to the new entity. The transfer in such cases is validated as soon as feasible through an on-site examination. The policy not only allows the Commission to act on the technicality of transferring accreditation to a new legal entity but, more importantly, to evaluate the effects of such a change in the operation of the on-going institution. These effects are often very significant, especially when changes occur in institutional purpose, structure, resources, and/or programs.

The policy has been most often applied in the junior-community college area, when accredited institutions formerly operated as part of unit or high school districts have become independent units with separate district support. Twenty-five junior colleges and three senior institutions have been acted upon in the past four years under the transfer of accreditation policy.

Retrospect and Prospect

This brief review of the major policies and procedures has attempted to portray the means through which the Commission assists institutions. Basic to each is the self-study approach, involvement of the various groups of the academic community, and an on-site evaluation by a team of examiners who represent a variety of areas of competencies and expertise. These efforts illustrate the Commission's endeavor to develop means for continual systematic study of institutional effectiveness.

Despite these efforts, long-standing but still unanswered questions continue to challenge those engaged in ac-

crediting activities. Is it possible to rely less on the structural-process variables which still dominate institutional evaluation and give more emphasis to the educational outcomes of the institution and its programs? In institutional evaluation it seems proper to proceed from an institution's statement of purpose, but under what circumstances, if any, should the accrediting agency question the purposes themselves? To what extent should all educational programs include a general education component and, if so, what can be said about its nature? How can a complex institution, such as a university with all interrelated functions, be more effectively appraised in the evaluative-accreditation process? How can the accrediting agency reduce unnecessary conformity and stimulate innovation? Does the institution-wide approach to accrediting offer adequate safeguards to those with special interests and thus reduce or avoid the need for proliferation of specialized accrediting agencies and duplication of efforts? To what extent and through which means can the Commission provide to the public more additional information about institutions than what appears in the listing of accredited institutions?

One matter of great significance has marked the evolution of the accrediting process, not only as carried out by this Commission but by others as well. This is the shift from the evaluation of an institution within a framework of fixed standards, using measurable, quantifiable characteristics, to an analysis of an institution's effectiveness in accomplishing its avowed purposes within a framework of general guidelines.[4] In this approach the emphasis is upon a group of experienced,

[4] For a review of the shift of emphasis see Zook, Geo. F. & Haggerty, M. E. *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions*, Vol. I-VI, Principles of Accrediting Higher Institutions, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936; North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Commission on Colleges and Universities, *Revised Manual of Accrediting*, 1941; *Guide for the Evaluation of Institutions of Higher Education*, Rev. 1965; *Guidelines for Institutions Offering Advanced Degree Programs*, 1970; *Tentative Guidelines for the Evaluation of Occupational Education*, 1969.

knowledgeable individuals applying their expertise and reasoned intelligence for accreditation purposes. Has this procedure resulted in too much reliance on subjective factors? To what extent are undesirable variations permitted by this approach both within a particular region and on a national basis?

These are but a few of the questions that surround the accreditation effort, particularly among the regional accrediting Commissions on Institutions of Higher Education.

To assist in resolving some of these problems and to permit the application of greater resources to the resolution of certain of these problems, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education has joined with the other representative Commissions on Higher Education to form the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE). The purpose of this organization is to promote the development of common policies and procedures, to exchange information, and to study the effectiveness of institutional accrediting as carried out by the constituent commissions.

During the past year a study was commissioned by the Federation and conducted to analyze the policies and procedures of each of the regional commissions, to identify weaknesses and areas where differences are causing problems, and to make recommendations for changes designed to strengthen institutional accreditation.[5] This report has been completed and a summary of its findings and recommendations is available from the Office of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions on Higher Education, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60615. This document and its

---

[5] Puffer, Claude E., Director; Steffens, H. Walter, Associate Director; Lombardi, John; Pfnister, Allan O. *Regional Accreditation of Institutions of Higher Education.* Vol. I and II, July, 1970.

recommendations are expected to have profound implications for the accrediting movement.

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education as a part of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is aware of the fundamental and important role that voluntary accreditation has played in the history of the development of higher educational institutions. The continuing favorable response of institutions and individuals indicates the basic strength of voluntary accreditation. However, the Commission itself must be continually responsive to changing needs as it seeks to promote vitality and self-renewal in institutions. Developments such as a strengthened Federation will help to point the way. Increased use of research techniques to aid in the solution of the problems facing accrediting is a necessity. Only through fulfilling its maximum potential for service to the institutions in its membership and institutions aspiring to membership will the commitment to, involvement in, and respect of the higher education community for the work of the Commission be maintained.

As one looks ahead, it is clear that there will be significant changes in the processes, methodology, structure, and, perhaps, even the purposes of accrediting. It is hoped that the leadership for accrediting will demonstrate the initiative, imagination, and flexibility which are essential if accrediting as a mechanism for quality control and improvement is to be equal to its task.

Procedures of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

Procedures of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education — Adopted March 26, 1969

1. The member institutions of higher education of the Association shall be grouped according to the following geographic districts:

District A — Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia
District B — Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin
District C — Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota
District D — Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma
District E — Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming

2. The member institutions of higher education of the Association shall be classified by type. The basis for this classification shall be the highest degree offered by an institution, if any.

3. The members of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education shall be selected from the member institutions by district and by type of institution. The doctor's degree-granting institutions in each of the five districts shall be entitled to two Commissioners for each ten institutions or major fraction thereof but with a maximum of four Commissioners. The master's and specialist's degree-granting institutions, the bachelor's degree-granting institutions, the associate degree-granting institutions, and the non-degree-granting institutions in each of the five districts shall be entitled to one

Commissioner for each ten institutions or major fraction thereof but with a maximum of four Commissioners. The Commissioners shall serve for four-year terms, one-fourth of the terms expiring each year, and shall be ineligible for reelection until one year has elapsed. At any one time there shall be no more than one Commissioner from any one institution.

The Commissioners in each district shall suggest persons annually to replace those whose terms have expired in accordance with the formula covering the distribution of Commissioners by type of institution within the district. The suggestions from the districts shall be submitted to the Nominating Committee for the Commission appointed annually by the Executive Board. The Nominating Committee for the Commission shall present its nominations to the Commission at the time of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Election of the Commissioners shall be by the representatives of the member institutions at the Annual Meeting on recommendation of the Commission.

4. The Commission on Secondary Schools shall designate three members of the Commission on Secondary Schools to serve on the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Secondary school members of the Commission shall serve for four-year terms or until expiration of their terms on the Commission on Secondary Schools, whichever is shorter.

5. Determination of institutional status, accredited or preaccredited, shall be made on the basis of on-site examinations conducted by teams appointed by the staff of the Commission with the authorization of the Executive Board. The reports of examining teams and other relevant materials shall be considered by reviewing committees composed of Commissioners supplemented by experienced evaluators or, in some cases, directly by the Executive Board of the Commission. The reviewing committees shall be set up by the staff of the

Commission with the authorization of the Executive Board of the Commission. The actions of the reviewing committees relative to the accredited status of institutions or a pre-accredited status shall be in the form of recommendations to the Executive Board.

A member institution of higher education shall not be removed from the list of accredited institutions without an on-site examination unless it (1) voluntarily withdraws its membership or (2) fails to comply with requirements of the Commission, such as the payment of dues and fees or the submission of reports. Institutions holding an established preaccredited status shall automatically lose that status upon reaching the end of the term for the status unless action is taken to change its status or grant an extension of its current status.

Each Commissioner shall be assigned to one of the reviewing committees.

The normal expectation is that the expenses of the Commissioners for attendance at the meetings of the Commission will be paid by their institutions.

6. The Executive Board of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education shall be composed of twelve persons, nine of whom shall be elected by the Commission and three by the Executive Board. All members shall serve for staggered terms of five years without opportunity for reelection until one year has elapsed. The members of the Executive Board shall be selected with due regard for geographic distribution and institutional type but without specification as to the number from each geographic district or type of institution. All members of the Executive Board shall be members of the Commission. If the Commission term of one of the nine Board members elected by the Commission expires before the expiration of his term on the Board he shall continue on the

Commission as an added member until the expiration of his term on the Board.

It shall be the responsibility of the Executive Board

(a) To consider all reports on the basis of which actions affecting the accredited status of institutions or a formally established preaccredited status may be taken. At the Spring Meeting of the Association the Executive Board shall make its recommendations for action on such matters to the Commission which in turn shall make its recommendations to the Association or to the Board of Directors acting for the Association. At other meetings, the recommendations of the Executive Board, acting for the Commission, shall be made directly to the Board of Directors acting for the Association.

(b) To appoint and consider the reports of *ad hoc* committees before such reports are presented to the Commission for action.

(c) To initiate possible policy changes and consider matters of policy brought to its attention through channels other than *ad hoc* committees before such matters are presented to the Commission.

(d) To initiate and conduct inquiries as needed about member institutions or institutions in a formally established pre-accredited status.

(e) To carry on all business of the Commission between meetings of the Commission.

The Executive Secretary of the Commission, elected by the Commission, shall be ex officio Secretary of the Executive Board. He shall serve for a three-year term and be eligible for reelection. He shall be ex officio a member of the Executive Board and the Commission.

7. Each member institution of higher education, including units of an institution accredited as operationally separate, shall designate one person as the official North Central Association representative, and he shall represent his institution at the Annual Meetings of the Association. It is expected that the representative will be the chief administrative officer of the institution or someone designated by him.

Revised March 1970

Published March 1971
Chicago, Illinois